arXiv:1702.08684v1 [math.CT] 28 Feb 2017

# ON THE UNIQUENESS OF CELLULAR INJECTIVES

J. ROSICKÝ

Abstract. A. Avilés and C. Brech [4] proved a intriguing result about the existence and uniqueness of certain injective Boolean algebras or Banach spaces. Their result refines the standard existence and uniqueness of saturated models. They express a wish to obtain a unified approach in the context of category theory. We provide this in the framework of weak factorization systems. Our basic tool is the fat small object argument (see [20]).

## 1. Introduction

The starting point of [4] is Parovičenko's theorem [21] saying that, under CH, $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin$ is the unique Boolean algebra of size continuum which is injective to embeddings between countable Boolean algebras in the category $\mathbf{Bool}_0$ of Boolean algebras and embeddings as morphisms. The main result of [4] says that if the continuum $c$ is a regular cardinal then there is the unique Boolean algebra $B$ of size $c$ which is tightly $\sigma$-filtered and injective in $\mathbf{Bool}_0$ to embeddings $f : X \to Y$ where $|X| < c$ and $f$ is a pushout of an embedding between countable Boolean algebras along an embedding. The proof is based on the result of Geschke [13] that a Boolean algebra is tightly $\sigma$-filtered if and only if it has an additive $\sigma$-skeleton. These concepts have a natural interpretation in the context of weak factorization systems (see [8]). If $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the set of embeddings between countable Boolean algebras then tightly $\sigma$-filtered is the same as $\mathcal{S}$-cellular. An additive $\sigma$-skeleton is replaced by the fat small object argument [20] which makes possible to represent an $\mathcal{S}$-cellular object by means of small $\mathcal{S}$-cellular subobjects. This approach works in any locally presentable category equipped with a suitable class $\mathcal{M}$ of monomorphisms and a suitable subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. In particular, it covers Banach spaces, which is the second case treated in [4]. Here $\mathcal{M}$ is the class of isometries and $\mathcal{S}$ consists of isometries between separable Banach spaces. The analogue of Parovičenko's theorem was established by Kubiś [18].

Locally presentable categories form a very broad class of categories incorporating varieties of universal algebras, categories of partially ordered sets, Banach spaces (with linear contractions), $C^*$-algebras and many others (see [19], [2]). Any object of a locally presentable category is equipped with an internal size corresponding to

*Date*: February 28, 2016.

Supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic under the grant P201/12/G028.

cardinalities in Boolean algebras and density characters in Banach spaces. In our examples, $\mathcal{M}$ will be the class of regular monomorphisms which should be stable under pushouts. This means that our locally presentable category should be coregular. Weak factorization systems originated in homotopy theory (see [8]) and provide a natural context for the notions of cellularity and cofibrancy. Usually, $\mathcal{S}$ consists of regular monomorphisms between $\lambda$-presentable objects. For a regular cardinal $\kappa$, we introduce $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{S},\kappa)$-injective objects generalizing injective Boolean algebras or Banach spaces of [4]. If $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrantly generated by $\mathcal{S}$ then these objects are the usual $\mathcal{M}$-saturated objects which are known to be unique (up to isomorphism). Both in Boolean algebras and in Banach spaces, $\mathcal{M}$ is not cofibrantly generated by $\mathcal{S}$ and the main result of [4] is that $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{S},\kappa)$-injectives are unique. Our main results generalize this. While [4] uses pushouts of $\mathcal{S}$-morphisms along $\mathcal{M}$-morphisms, we use pushouts along arbitrary morphisms. But, due to the (epimorphism, regular monomorphism) factorizations, this leads to the same concepts.

In the first two sections we recall locally presentable categories and weak factorization systems. The last lemma of the first section shows that the basic property of $\mathcal{S}$ is valid in any coregular category. The second section ends with establishing some features of the fat small object argument which are not included in [20]. Our main results are in the third section and examples are treated if the forth section.

## 2. Locally presentable categories

Our basic framework will be a locally presentable category equipped with a factorization system $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{M})$. Recall that a category $\mathcal{K}$ is locally $\lambda$-presentable ($\lambda$ is a regular cardinal) if it is cocomplete and has a set $\mathcal{A}$ of $\lambda$-presentable objects such that every object is a $\lambda$-directed colimit of objects from $\mathcal{A}$. An object $A$ is $\lambda$-presentable if the hom-functor $\mathcal{K}(A,-):\mathcal{K}\to\mathbf{Set}$ preserves $\lambda$-directed colimits. A category $\mathcal{K}$ is locally presentable if it is locally $\lambda$-presentable for some $\lambda$. By a factorization system $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{M})$ in $\mathcal{K}$ we mean the classical concept of J. R. Isbell: $\mathcal{E}$ is a class of epimorphisms closed under composition, $\mathcal{M}$ a class of monomorphisms closed under composition, $\mathcal{M}\cap\mathcal{E}$ is the class of all isomorphisms of $\mathcal{K}$ and each morphism $f$ of $\mathcal{K}$ has an esentially unique factorization $f=me$ where $e\in\mathcal{E}$ and $m\in\mathcal{M}$. In any locally presentable category we have the factorization systems (epimorphism, strong monomorphism) and (strong epimorphism, monomorphism) (see [2] 1.61).

**Remark 2.1.** (1) If $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{M})$ is a factorization system then $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the cancellation property

(C1) $gf\in\mathcal{M}$ and $g\in\mathcal{M}$ implies that $f\in\mathcal{M}$.

(see [25]).

(2) Let $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the category having the same objects as $\mathcal{K}$ but morphisms are only those belonging to $\mathcal{M}$. Then $\mathcal{K}$ is an iso-full subcategory of $\mathcal{K}$ (because any isomorphism belongs to $\mathcal{M}$). Let $\mathcal{K}$ be locally $\lambda$-presentable and $\mathcal{A}$ be its set of

$\lambda$-presentable objects. Then every object of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a $\lambda$-directed colimit in $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{E}$-quotients of objects of $\mathcal{A}$ and these objects are $\lambda$-presentable in $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (see [3]).

Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is closed under $\lambda$-directed colimits. This means that, having a $\lambda$-directed diagram $D : \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{K}$ with $D(f) \in \mathcal{M}$ for any $f \in \mathcal{D}$ with a colimit cocone $\delta : D \to \operatorname{colim} D$ then $\delta_d \in \mathcal{M}$ for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and, moreover, having a cocone $\varphi : D \to K$ with $\varphi_d \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$, then the induced morphism $\operatorname{colim} D \to K$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. In this case, $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is $\lambda$-accessible. Thus $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an accessible iso-full subcategory of a locally presentable category which is closed under $\lambda$-filtered colimits and is coherent (this is the cancellation property (C1) from 2.1). Thus $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a $\lambda$-abstract elementary class in the sense of [10]. This always happens when $\mathcal{M}$ is the class of regular monomorphisms (see [2], 1.62).

Let $\kappa$ be a regular cardinal. An object $K$ of a category $\mathcal{K}$ has the presentability rank $\kappa$ if it is $\kappa$-presentable but not $\mu$-presentable for any regular cardinal $\mu < \kappa$. If $\mathcal{K}$ is locally $\lambda$-presentable and $K$ is not $\lambda$-presentable then the presentability rank of $K$ is a successor cardinal $\mu^+$ (see [9] 4.2). Then $\mu$ is called the size of $K$.

**Notation 2.2.** Given a class $\mathcal{X}$ of morphisms in $\mathcal{K}$, $\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{X})$ will denote the class of all pushouts of morphisms from $\mathcal{X}$. This means that, given a pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{g} & D \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & C \end{array}$$

with $f$ in $\mathcal{X}$ then $g$ belongs to $\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{X})$. By taking only $f : A \to C$ in $\mathcal{X}$ with $A$ and $C$ $\kappa$-presentable, we get the class $\operatorname{Po}_\kappa(\mathcal{X})$.

$\operatorname{Tc}(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the class of transfinite compositions of morphisms from $\mathcal{X}$. This means that $f : K \to L$ is in $\operatorname{Tc}(\mathcal{X})$ if there is a smooth chain $(f_{ij} \colon K_i \to K_j)_{i<j\leq\lambda}$ (i.e., $\lambda$ is an ordinal, $(f_{ij} \colon K_i \to K_j)_{i<j}$ is a colimit for any limit ordinal $j \leq \lambda$) such that $f_{i,i+1} \in \mathcal{X}$ for each $i < \lambda$ and $f = f_{0\lambda}$. In particular, any isomorphism is in $\operatorname{Tc}(\mathcal{X})$ (for $\lambda = 0$), any morphism from $\mathcal{X}$ is in $\operatorname{Tc}(\mathcal{X})$ (for $\lambda = 1$) and $\operatorname{Tc}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under composition. $\kappa$-$\operatorname{Tc}(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the class of transfinite compositions of length smaller than $\kappa$, i.e., $\lambda < \kappa$. The class $\operatorname{cell}(\mathcal{X}) = \operatorname{Tc}(\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{X}))$ is the class of $\mathcal{X}$-cellular morphisms.

**Definition 2.3.** A factorization system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ in a locally presentable category $\mathcal{K}$ will be called *special* if $\operatorname{cell}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}$.

In a factorization system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$, $\mathcal{E}$ is determined by $\mathcal{M}$ (and $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathcal{E}$). Thus we will just say that $\mathcal{M}$ is *special*.

A category is called coregular if it is finitely complete and regular monomorphisms are stable under pushouts. This means that the class $\mathcal{M}$ of all regular monomorphisms satisfies $\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}$. Any coregular category has the factorization system

(epimorphism, regular monomorphism). Thus regular and strong monomorphisms coincide in every locally presentable coregular category.

**Remark 2.4.** Assume that $\mathcal{K}$ is a locally presentable category equipped with a special factorization system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$. A pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{g} & D \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & C \end{array}$$

in $\mathcal{K}$ with $f$ and $u$ in $\mathcal{M}$ does not need to be a pushout in $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$ because the unique morphism $D \to D'$ to another commutative square in $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \longrightarrow & D' \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & \uparrow \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & C \end{array}$$

does not need to be in $\mathcal{M}$.

But these pushouts provide (a strong form of) the amalgamation property of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Usually, $\mathcal{K}$ will be coregular and $\mathcal{M}$ will be the class of regular monomorphisms.

**Examples 2.5.** (1) In any locally finitely presentable coregular category, the class of regular monomorphisms is special. Moreover, it is closed under directed colimits (see [2], 1.62).

(2) The category **Bool** of Boolean algebras is locally finitely presentable and regular monomorphisms coincide with monomorphisms. The dual of **Bool** is the category of compact Hausdorff zero-dimensional spaces which is regular as an epi-reflective full subcategory of compact Hausdorff spaces. Thus **Bool** is coregular and regular monomorphisms form a special class. If a Boolean algebra $B$ is not finite then its size is equal to the cardinality of the underlying set of $B$.

(2) The category **Ban** of Banach spaces and their linear operators of norm at most 1 is coregular (see [5] 2.1) and locally $\aleph_1$-presentable (see [2] 1.48). Regular monomorphisms coincide with isometries and they are closed under directed colimits. Thus the class of regular monomorphisms is special. If a Banach space is not finitely dimensional then its size is equal to its density character.

(3) Any Grothendieck topos is coregular and regular monomorphisms coincide with monomorphisms. Thus, in a locally presentable Grothendieck topos, regular monomorphisms form a special class.

The same holds for any Grothendieck category.

The following result will be important later.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a coregular category, $f : A \to B$, $g : B \to C$, $h : X \to Y$ and $u : X \to A$ regular monomorphisms and*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{gf} & C \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ X & \xrightarrow[h]{} & Y \end{array}$$

*a pushout. If*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{g} & C \\ {\scriptstyle p}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ P & \xrightarrow[q]{} & Y \end{array}$$

*is a pullback then it is a pushout.*

*Proof.* Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \xrightarrow{g} & C \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & {\scriptstyle p}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ X & \xrightarrow[t]{} & P & \xrightarrow[q]{} & Y \end{array}$$

where $t$ is the induced morphism to the pullback. Following [23], pushouts of regular monomorphisms are pullbacks. Since $qt = h$, the outer rectangle is a pullback and thus the left square is a pullback. Since $f$ is a regular monomorphism, $t$ is a regular monomorphism. Consider the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\bar{t}} & Q \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \bar{u}} \\ X & \xrightarrow[t]{} & P \end{array}$$

There is a unique morphism $w : Q \to B$ such that $w\bar{t} = f$ and $w\bar{u} = p$. Since pushouts of regular monomorphisms are pullbacks, the left square in

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{\bar{t}} & Q & \xrightarrow{gw} & C \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & {\scriptstyle \bar{u}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ X & \xrightarrow[t]{} & P & \xrightarrow[q]{} & Y \end{array}$$

is a pullback. Sincre the outer rectangle is a pullback, the right square is a pullback. Hence the left square in




is a pullback and thus $w$ is an isomorphism. Therefore the left square in the starting rectangle is a pushout. Thus the right square is a pushout. □

## 3. Weak factorization systems

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a class of morphisms in a category $\mathcal{K}$. Recall that an object $K$ of $\mathcal{K}$ is $\mathcal{M}$-injective if for any morphism $f : A \to B$ from $\mathcal{M}$ and any morphism $g : A \to K$ there is a morphism $h : B \to K$ such that $hf = g$. One says that $\mathcal{K}$ has enough $\mathcal{M}$-injectives if for any object $K$ from $\mathcal{K}$ there is a morphism $K \to L$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $L$ is $\mathcal{M}$-injective. This property is closely related to weak factorization systems.

Let $f\colon A \to B$, $g\colon C \to D$ morphisms in $\mathcal{K}$ such that in each commutative square




there is a diagonal $d\colon B \to C$ with $df = u$ and $gd = v$. Then $g$ has the right lifting property w.r.t. $f$ and $f$ has the left lifting property w.r.t. $g$. For a class $\mathcal{X}$ of morphisms of $\mathcal{K}$ we put

$$\mathcal{X}^{\square} = \{g \mid g \text{ has the right lifting property w.r.t. each } f \in \mathcal{X}\} \text{ and}$$
$${}^{\square}\mathcal{X} = \{f \mid f \text{ has the left lifting property w.r.t. each } g \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

A weak factorization system $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ in a category $\mathcal{K}$ consists of two classes $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ of morphisms of $\mathcal{K}$ such that

(1) $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}^{\square}$, $\mathcal{M} = {}^{\square}\mathcal{N}$, and
(2) any morphism $h$ of $\mathcal{K}$ has a factorization $h = gf$ with $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $g \in \mathcal{N}$.

Having a weak factorization system $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ in a category $\mathcal{K}$ with a terminal object 1 then $\mathcal{K}$ has enough $\mathcal{M}$-injectives. It suffices to take the weak factorization of a unique morphism $K \to L \to 1$. On the other hand, consider the following strengthening of the cancellation property (C1)

(C2) $gf \in \mathcal{M}$ implies that $f \in \mathcal{M}$.

If $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies (C2) then $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^{\square})$ is a weak factorization system if and only if $\mathcal{K}$ has enough $\mathcal{M}$-injectives (see [1] 1.6).

A weak factorization system $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$ is called cofibrantly generated if there is a set $\mathcal{X}$ of morphisms such that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{X}^{\square}$. In this case, $\mathcal{M}$-injectives coincide with $\mathcal{X}$-injectives. If $\mathcal{K}$ is locally presentable and $\mathcal{X}$ a set of morphisms then $({}^{\square}(\mathcal{X}^{\square}), \mathcal{X}^{\square})$ is a weak factorization system (see [8]). The class ${}^{\square}(\mathcal{X}^{\square})$ has a better description.

A morphism is $\mathcal{X}$-cofibrant if it is a retract an $\mathcal{X}$-cellular morphism in some comma category $K\backslash\mathcal{K}$. We will use the notation $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{X})$ for the resulting class of morphisms. Then ${}^{\square}(\mathcal{X}^{\square}) = \mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{X})$.

$\mathcal{X}$ is called cofibrantly closed if $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$. If $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$ is a weak factorization system then $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrantly closed. Any special class $\mathcal{M}$ containing split monomorphisms is cofibrantly closed. Any split monomorphism is regular.

**Examples 3.1.** (1) Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the class of regular monomorphisms in **Bool**. Then $\mathcal{M}$-injective Boolean algebras are precisely complete Boolean algebras and **Bool** has enough $\mathcal{M}$-injectives (see [15]). Since regular monomorphisms coincide with monomorphisms, they have the cancellation property (C2). But $\mathcal{M}$ is not cofibrantly generated because, for a set $\mathcal{X}$ of regular monomorphisms, $\mathcal{X}$-injectives contain all $\kappa$-complete Boolean algebras where the domains and the codomains of morphisms of $\mathcal{X}$ are $\kappa$-presentable.

(2) Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the class of regular monomorphisms in **Ban**. Then $\mathcal{M}$-injective Banach spaces are precisely Banach spaces $C(X)$ where $X$ is an extremally disconnected compact Hausdorff spaces and **Ban** has enough $\mathcal{M}$-injectives (see [12]). Since regular monomorphisms coincide with isometries, they have the cancellation property (C2). But $\mathcal{M}$ is not cofibrantly generated because, for a set $\mathcal{X}$ of regular monomorphisms, $\mathcal{X}$-injectives contain all $(1,\kappa)$-injective Banach spaces where the codomains of morphisms of $\mathcal{X}$ are $\kappa$-presentable (see [6]).

(3) Any Grothendieck topos has enough injectives with respect to regular monomorphisms. The same is true for any Grothendieck category. For instance, these injectives in the category **Ab** of abelian groups are precisely divisible groups. In all these cases, regular monomorphisms coincide with monomorphisms and thus have the cancellation property (C2). In these cases, the class $\mathcal{M}$ of regular monomorphisms is always cofibrantly generated (see [8]). For instance, in **Ab** by $n\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

An object $K$ is $\mathcal{X}$-cellular if $O \to K$ is $\mathcal{X}$-cellular where $O$ is an initial object of $\mathcal{K}$. This means that there is a smooth chain $(f_{ij}\colon K_i \to K_j)_{i<j\leq\lambda}$ such that $f_{i,i+1} \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{X})$ for each $i < \lambda$, $K_0 = O$ and $K_\lambda = K$. If $\mathcal{K}$ is locally presentable and $\mathcal{X}$ is a set of morphisms between $\kappa$-presentable objects this chain does not need to be $\kappa$-directed and objects $K_i$, $i < \lambda$ do not need to be $\kappa$-presentable. Fat small object argument improves this.

Recall that a poset $P$ is well-founded if every of its nonempty subsets contains a minimal element. Given $x \in P$, $\downarrow x = \{y \in P \mid y \leq x\}$ denotes the initial segment generated by $x$. A poset $P$ is *good* if it is well-founded and has a least element $\perp$.

A good poset is called $\kappa$-*good* if all its initial segments $\downarrow x$ have cardinality $< \kappa$. An element $x$ of a good poset $P$ is called *isolated* if

$$\Downarrow x = \{y \in P \mid y < x\}$$

has a top element $x^-$ which is called the *predecessor* of $x$. A non-isolated element distinct from $\perp$ is called *limit*. Given $x < y$ in a poset $P$, we denote $xy$ the unique morphism $x \to y$ in the category $P$. A diagram $D\colon P \to \mathcal{K}$ is smooth if, for every limit $x \in P$, the diagram $(D(yx)\colon Dy \to Dx)_{y<x}$ is a colimit cocone on the restriction of $D$ to $\Downarrow x$. A good diagram $D\colon P \to \mathcal{K}$ is a smooth diagram whose shape category $P$ is a good poset. The composite of $D$ is the component $\delta_\perp$ of a colimit cocone. Following [20], transfinite compositions of morphisms from $\mathcal{X}$ can be replaced by composites of good diagrams with links in $\mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{X})$.

If $\mathcal{K}$ is locally $\kappa$-presentable and $\mathcal{X}$ is a set of morphisms between $\kappa$-presentable objects then any $\mathcal{X}$-cellular object $K$ of $\mathcal{K}$ is a colimit of a $\kappa$-good $\kappa$-directed diagram $D : P \to \mathcal{K}$ of $\kappa$-presentable objects with $D \perp = O$ and links in $\mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{X})$ (see [20] 4.11 and 4.15).

**Remark 3.2.** (1) By inspecting the proof of [20] 4.11, one sees that the constructed $\kappa$-good $\kappa$-directed diagram has the property that for any $Q \subseteq P$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ one has $\mathrm{colim}_Q D = Dx$ for some $x \in P$. Here, $\mathrm{colim}_Q D$ denotes the colimit of the restriction of $D$ on $Q$. One proceeds by recursion and, at the step $\alpha = \beta + 1$ of this proof, one uses the fact that pushouts commute with colimits. For $\alpha$ limit, one observes that the $*$-construction from [20] 4.10 has the needed property.

(2) A general good diagram $D : P \to \mathcal{K}$ does not need to have the property that for any $Q \subseteq P$ one either has $\mathrm{colim}_Q D = Dx$ for some $x \in P$ or $\mathrm{colim}_Q D = \mathrm{colim}\, P$. But, using [20] 4.8, any good diagram can be extended to a new one having this property and the same colimit.

**Remark 3.3.** Let $D : P \to \mathcal{K}$ be a $\kappa$-good $\kappa$-directed diagram with the property from 3.2(1), $K = \mathrm{colim}\, D$ and $\lambda \leq \kappa$ a regular cardinal.

(1) Let $h : X \to K$ with $X$ $\lambda$-presentable. Then $h$ factorizes through a component $\delta_x : Dx \to K$ of a colimit cocone. Clearly, $h$ factorizes through any $\delta_y$, $x \leq y$. Choose $z \in P$ and let $y$ be a minimal $z \leq y$ such that $h$ factorizes through $\delta_y$. Then the interval $[z, y) = \{x \in P | z \leq x < y\}$ is $\kappa$-good and $D(zy) : Dz \to Dy$ is the composite of $D$ restricted on $[z, y)$. Express $[z, y)$ as a $\lambda$-directed union of subsets $z \in Z_i$ of cardinality $< \lambda$. Then $Dy$ is a $\lambda$-directed colimit of $\mathrm{colim}_{Z_i} D$. Since $X$ is $\lambda$-presentable, $h$ factorizes through some of these colimits. Using 3.2(1), $\mathrm{colim}_{Z_i} D = Dt_i$. By the minimality of $y$, we have $Dy = Dt_i$ for some $i$. Hence $D(zy)$ is a composite of a $\kappa$-good diagram of size $< \lambda$. Following [20] 4.6, $D(zy)$ belongs to $\lambda$-$\mathrm{Tc}\,\mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{X})$.

(2) Let $u, v : X \to Dx$ satisfy $\delta_x u = \delta_x v$. Since $X$ is $\lambda$-presentable, there is $x \leq y$ such that $D(xy)u = D(xy)v$. Take a minimal $y$ with this property. Express $[x, y)$ as a $\lambda$-directed union of subsets $x \in Z_i$ of cardinality $< \lambda$. Since $X$ is $\lambda$-presentable, $u$

and $v$ are equalized by the morphism from $Dx$ to some $\operatorname{colim}_{Z_i} D$. By the minimality of $y$, one again gets that $D(xy) \in \lambda\text{-Tc}\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{X})$.

## 4. Special injectives

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a special class of morphisms in $\mathcal{K}$. For a subclass $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, we say that an object $K$ is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M})$-*injective* if for any morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{S}$ and any morphism $g : A \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ there is a morphism $h : B \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $hf = g$.

For a subset $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ we get a weak factorization system $(\operatorname{cof}(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S}^{\square})$ and $\operatorname{cell}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$.

**Definition 4.1.** Let $\kappa$ be a regular cardinal. We say that an object $K$ is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-*injective* if for any morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ with $A$ $\kappa$-presentable and any morphism $g : A \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ there is a morphism $h : B \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $hf = g$.

**Definition 4.2.** Let $\lambda$ be a regular cardinal. We say that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is $\lambda$-*special* if

(S1) the domains and codomains of morphisms in $\mathcal{S}$ are $\lambda$-presentable,
(S2) $\mathcal{S}$ contains all isomorphisms between $\lambda$-presentable objects,
(S3) $\lambda\text{-Tc}\operatorname{Po}_\lambda(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S}$,
(S4) $gf \in \operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{S})$, $f \in \operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ and $g \in \mathcal{M}$ implies that $g \in \operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{S})$.

The pair $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S})$ is $\lambda$-*special* if $\mathcal{M}$ is special and $\mathcal{S}$ is $\lambda$-special.

Observe that (S1) implies that $\mathcal{S}$ is a set.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a locally $\lambda$-presentable category, $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S})$ a $\lambda$-special pair and $\lambda \leq \kappa$ regular cardinals. Then any two $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injectives of the same size $\kappa$ are isomorphic.*

*Proof.* Let $K$ and $L$ be $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injectives of the same size $\kappa$. Following [20] 4.11 and 4.15(1), we express them as colimits of $\kappa$-good $\kappa$-directed diagrams $(k_{ii'} : K_i \to K_{i'})_{i \leq i' \in I}$ and $(l_{jj'} : L_j \to L_{j'})_{j \leq j' \in J}$ of $\kappa$-presentable $\mathcal{S}$-cellular objects with links in $\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ and such that $K_\perp = L_\perp = O$. . Colimit cocones are denoted as $k_i : K_i \to K$ and $l_j : L_j \to L$. The composites of these diagrams are $k_\perp : O \to K$ and $l_\perp : O \to L$. In the same time, we can express $K$ and $L$ as $\lambda$-directed colimits of size $\kappa$ consiting of $\lambda$-presentable objects (see [19] 2.3.11). We well-order these objects as $(X_\alpha)_{\alpha<\kappa}$ (for $K$) and $(Y_\alpha)_{\alpha<\kappa}$ (for $L$). We will construct subchains $K_{i_\alpha}$ and $L_{j_\alpha}$ of the starting $\kappa$-good $\kappa$-directed diagrams and compatible isomorphisms $h_\alpha : K_{i_\alpha} \to L_{j_\alpha}$ (i.e., $h_\beta k_{i_\alpha i_\beta} = l_{j_\alpha j_\beta} h_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \beta$) such that $X_\alpha \to K$ factorizes through $k_{i_{\alpha+1}} : K_{i_{\alpha+1}} \to K$ and $Y_\alpha \to L$ factorizes through $l_{i_{\alpha+1}} : L_{j_{\alpha+1}} \to L$ for each $\alpha < \kappa$. Then $\operatorname{colim}_{\alpha<\kappa} h_\alpha : K \to L$ is the desired isomorphism.

At first, $i_0 = \perp = j_0$ and $h_0$ is the identity $K_{i_0} = O \to O = L_{i_0}$. At limit steps we take colimits (by using 3.2(1)). Assume that we have $h_\alpha$. Since $X_\alpha$ is $\lambda$-presentable, we can take a minimal $x_1 \geq i_\alpha$ such that $X_\alpha \to K$ factorizes through $k_{x_1} : K_{x_1} \to K$. Following 3.3(1) and [20] 4.21, $k_{i_\alpha x_1} \in \lambda\text{-Tc}\operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{S}) = \operatorname{Po}\lambda\text{-Tc}\operatorname{Po}_\lambda(\mathcal{S}) = \operatorname{Po}(\mathcal{S})$. Thus

there is a pushout




with $w \in \mathcal{S}$. Since $L$ is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective, there is $f_1 : K_{x_1} \to L$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $f_1 k_{i_\alpha x_1} = l_{j_\alpha} h_\alpha$. Since $B$ is $\lambda$-presentable, there is $y \geq j_\alpha$ and $q : B \to L_y$ such that $l_y q = f_1 v$. Following 3.3(1) and [20] 4.21, for a minimal such $y$ we have $l_{j_\alpha y} \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$. Since $A$ is $\lambda$-presentable and $l_y q w = f_1 v w = f_1 k_{i_\alpha x_1} u = l_{j_\alpha} h_\alpha u = l_y l_{j_\alpha y} h_\alpha u$, there is $y' \geq y$ such that $l_{yy'} q w = l_{yy'} l_{j_\alpha y} h_\alpha u = l_{j_\alpha y'} h_\alpha u$. Following 3.3(2), for a minimal such $y'$ we have $l_{yy'} \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$. Now, there is $\bar{q} : K_{x_1} \to L_{y'}$ such that $\bar{q} v = l_{y'y} q$ and $\bar{q} k_{i_\alpha x_1} = l_{j_\alpha y'} h_\alpha$. Finally, there is $y_1 \geq y'$ such that $Y_\alpha \to L$ factorizes through $l_{y_1}$. Following 3.3(1), for a minimal such $y_1$ we have $l_{y'y_1} \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$. Hence $l_{j_\alpha y_1} \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ and, for $h_{\alpha 1} = l_{y'y_1} \bar{q}$ we have $h_{\alpha 1} k_{i_\alpha x_1} = l_{y'y_1} \bar{q} k_{i_\alpha x_1} = l_{y'y_1} l_{j_\alpha y'} h_\alpha = l_{j_\alpha y_1} h_\alpha$ and $l_{y_1} h_{\alpha 1} = f_1$. The second equality is a consequence of $l_{y_1} h_{\alpha_1} v = l_{y_1} l_{y'y_1} \bar{q} v = l_{y'} l_{yy'} q = l_y q = f_1 v$ and $l_{y_1} h_{\alpha 1} k_{i_\alpha x_1} = l_{y_1} l_{y'y_1} \bar{q} k_{i_\alpha x_1} = l_{y'} l_{j_\alpha y'} h_\alpha = l_{j_\alpha} h_\alpha = f_1 k_{i_\alpha x_1}$.

Following [20] 4.5, $l_{y_1} \in \mathrm{cell}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies (C1) and $l_{y_1} h_{\alpha 1} = f_1$, we have $h_{\alpha 1} \in \mathcal{M}$. Hence $h_{\alpha 1} \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ because $k_{i_\alpha x_1}$, $l_{j_\alpha y_1}$ and $h_\alpha$ belong to $\mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$. Since $K$ is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective, there is $t_1 : L_{y_1} \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $t_1 h_{\alpha 1} = k_{x_1}$. Analogously as above, there is $g_1 : L_{x_1} \to K_{x_2}$ such that $t_1 = k_{x_2} g_1$ and $g_1 h_{\alpha 1} = k_{x_1 x_2}$. Again, $k_{x_2} \in \mathcal{M}$ and thus $g_1 \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $h_{\alpha 1}, k_{x_1 x_2} \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$, we have $g_1 \in \mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$. Since $L$ is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective, there is $f_2 : K_{x_2} \to L$ in $\mathcal{M}$ with $f_2 g_1 = l_{y_1}$. We have $f_2 k_{x_1 x_2} = f_2 g_1 h_{\alpha 1} = l_{y_1} h_{\alpha 1} = f_1$. In the same way as above, we get $h_{\alpha 2} : K_{x_2} \to L_{y_2}$ in $\mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ such that $h_{\alpha 2} g_1 = l_{y_1 y_2}$. Hence $h_{\alpha 2} k_{x_1 x_2} = l_{y_1 y_2} h_{\alpha 1}$. By continuing this procedure for all $n < \omega$, we get $K_{i_{\alpha+1}} = \mathrm{colim}_{n<\omega} K_{x_n}$, $L_{j_{\alpha+1}} = \mathrm{colim}_{n<\omega} L_{y_n}$ and an isomorphism $h_{\alpha+1} = \mathrm{colim}_{n<\omega} h_{\alpha n}$. □

**Remark 4.4.** (1) Because $l_y \in \mathcal{M}$ is a monomorphism, we could take $y' = y$ in the proof above. Our argument would work in a more general situation when $\mathcal{M}$ does not consist of monomorphisms.

(2) In this generality, one cannot expect the existence of an $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective of a given size $\kappa$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be special and $\mathcal{S}$ consist of isomorphisms between $\lambda$-presentable objects. Then $\mathrm{Po}(S)$ consists of isomorphisms and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S})$ is $\lambda$-special. Then any object is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective but $O$ is the only $\mathcal{S}$-cellular object and it is finitely presentable.

Let $\mathcal{K}_\lambda$ be a representative full subcategory of $\mathcal{K}$ consisting of $\lambda$-presentable objects and $\mathcal{M}_\lambda$ consist of all morphisms in $\mathcal{K}_\lambda$ belonging to $\mathcal{M}$.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a locally $\lambda$-presentable category, $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S})$ a $\lambda$-special pair and $\lambda \leq \kappa$ regular cardinals such that $|\mathcal{K}_\lambda| \leq \kappa$ and $\kappa^{<\lambda} = \kappa$. Assume that there*

*is a non-initial object $N$ such that $O \to N$ is in $\mathcal{S}$. Then there exists an $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective of the size $\kappa$.*

*Proof.* Let $K$ be a $\kappa^+$-presentable object of $\mathcal{K}$. Such an object always exists, we can take $K = O$. Following [19] 2.3.11 and 2.3.4, there is $\leq \kappa$ morphisms from $A \in \mathcal{K}_\lambda$ to $K$. In fact, since $\lambda \triangleleft \kappa^+$, $K$ is $\lambda$-directed colimit of $\lambda$-presentable objects $X$ over a diagram of cardinality $\leq \kappa$. Since any morphism $A \to K$ factorizes through some $X$, we get our estimate. Thus there is $\leq \kappa$ of spans

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & K \\ & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle u} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B \end{array}$$

where $f \in \mathcal{S}$. We index these spans by ordinals $i \leq \alpha$ where $\alpha \leq \kappa$. We construct a smooth chain $c_{ij} : K'_i \to K'_j$, $i \leq j \leq \alpha$ starting with $K'_0 = K$. Let $K'_1$ be the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{c_{01}} & K'_1 \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle u_0} & & \uparrow \\ A_0 & \xrightarrow[f_0]{} & B_0 \end{array}$$

At limit steps we take colimits and, given $K'_i$ we take the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K'_i & \xrightarrow{c_{i,i+1}} & K'_{i+1} \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle c_{0i}u_i} & & \uparrow \\ A_i & \xrightarrow[f_i]{} & B_i \end{array}$$

Then the object $K^* = K'_\alpha$ is $\kappa^+$-presentable and $\mathcal{S}$-cellular and the morphism $c_K = c_{0\alpha} : K \to K^*$ is $\mathcal{S}$-cellular. Form a new smooth chain $(k_{ij} : K_i \to K_j)_{i<j\leq\kappa}$ such that $K_0 = K$ and $K_{i+1} = K^*_i$ and $k_{i,i+1} = c_{K_i}$. Then $K_\kappa$ is $\kappa^+$-presentable and $\mathcal{S}$-cellular.

Consider $h : C \to D$ in $\mathrm{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ with $C$ $\kappa$-presentable and $u : C \to K_\kappa$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Since $C$ is $\kappa$-presentable, there is a factorization of $u$ through $u' : C \to K_i$ for some $i < \kappa$.

Hence $u' \in \mathcal{M}$. We have a pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \xrightarrow{h} & D \\ {\scriptstyle v_1}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle v_2} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B \end{array}$$

with $f \in \mathcal{S}$ and a span

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_i & & \\ {\scriptstyle u'v_1}\uparrow & & \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B \end{array}$$

which is one of $(u, f)$ for $K_i$. We can assume that this is the first span $(u_0, f_0)$. Consider the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_i & \xrightarrow{p} & P \\ {\scriptstyle u'v_1}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle q} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f]{} & B \end{array}$$

Since $K_{i+1}$ is obtained by iteratively taking pushouts starting with $P$, the induced morphism $t : P \to K_{i+1}$ is $\mathcal{S}$-cellular. Since

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_i & \xrightarrow{p} & P \\ {\scriptstyle u'}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle q'} \\ C & \xrightarrow[h]{} & D \end{array}$$

is a pushout, $u = k_i u' = k_{i+1} c_{K_i} u' = k_{i+1} tpu' = k_{i+1} tq'h$ and $k_{i+1} tq'$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}$, $K_\kappa$ is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective.

The object $K_\kappa$ is $\kappa^+$-presentable. Assume that it is $\kappa$-presentable. Let $N$ be a non-initial object such that $O \to N$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}$. Since

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_\kappa & \xrightarrow{i_1} & K_\kappa \coprod N \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ O & \longrightarrow & N \end{array}$$

is a pushout, the coproduct injection $i_1$ belongs to $Po(\mathcal{S})$. Assume that $i_1$ is an isomorphism and consider morphisms $u, v : N \to L$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{K_\kappa} \coprod u i_1 = \mathrm{id}_{K_\kappa} =$

$\mathrm{id}_{K_\kappa} \coprod vi_1$, we have $\mathrm{id}_{K_\kappa} \coprod u = \mathrm{id}_{K_\kappa} \coprod v$ and thus $u = v$. Since $N$ is not initial, $i_1$ is not an isomorphism. Since $K_\kappa$ is $\kappa$-presentable and $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective, there is $h : K_\kappa \coprod N \to K_\kappa$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $hi_1 = \mathrm{id}_{K_\kappa}$. Thus $h$ is an isomorphism and therefore $i_1$ is an isomorphism. We have proved that $K_\kappa$ is of size $\kappa$. □

**Remark 4.6.** We have proved that any $\kappa^+$-presentable $\mathcal{S}$-cellular object is an $\mathcal{S}$-cellular subobject of an $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective object of size $\kappa$.

## 5. Applications

An object $K$ of size $\kappa$ will be called $\mathcal{M}$-*saturated* if for any $: A \to B$ in $\mathcal{M}$ with $A, B$ $\kappa$-presentable and any $g : A \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ there is $h : B \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $hf = g$.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be locally $\lambda$-presentable category and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S})$ a $\lambda$-special pair such that $\mathcal{M}$ contains split monomorphisms, is closed under directed colimits and $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{S})$. Let $\lambda \leq \kappa$ be a regular cardinal such that $|\mathcal{K}_\lambda| \leq \kappa$ and $\kappa^{<\lambda} = \kappa$. Then an $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective object of size $\kappa$ is $\mathcal{M}$-saturated.*

*Proof.* Consider a morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{M}$ with $A$ and $B$ $\kappa$-presentable. Let

$$f : A \xrightarrow{f_1} A_\kappa \xrightarrow{f_2} B$$

be a $(\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S}^\square)$ factorization of $f$ (see [8] 1.3, the construction is recalled in the proof of 4.3 in the case of $f : K \to 1$). Since $f_2$ has the right lifting property w.r.t. $f$ there is a diagonal $t : B \to A_\kappa$ in the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_B} & B \\ {\scriptstyle f}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle f_2} \\ A & \xrightarrow[f_1]{} & A_\kappa \end{array}$$

Since $B$ is $\kappa$-presentable, $t$ factorizes through some $A_i$, $i < \kappa$ as

$$t : B \xrightarrow{t_1} A_i \xrightarrow{k_{i\kappa}} A_\kappa$$

Since $f_2 k_{i\kappa} t_1 = f_2 t = \mathrm{id}_B$, $t_1$ is a split momorphism and thus $t_1 \in \mathcal{M}$.

Consider $g : A \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Since $K$ is $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{M}, \kappa)$-injective and $\mathcal{M}$ is closed under directed colimits, by recursion we get $g_i : A_i \to K$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $g_0 = g$ and $g_{j'} k_{jj'} = g_j$ for $j \leq j' \leq i$. Hence $g_i t_1 f = g$ and $g_i t_1 \in \mathcal{M}$. □

**Remark 5.2.** In this case, we do not need the fat small object argument to prove 4.3 – it follows from [24] Theorem 2.

**Example 5.3.** In the category **Ab** of abelian groups, the assumptions of 5.1 are satisfied for the class $\mathcal{M}$ of monomorphisms and $\lambda = \aleph_0$.

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the class of all monomorphisms in* **Bool** *and $\mathcal{S}$ consist of monomorphisms between countable Boolean algebras. Then $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S})$ is $\aleph_1$-special.*

*Proof.* $\mathcal{M}$ is special following 2.5 (2). Boolean algebras of size $\aleph_0$ coincide with countable Boolean algebras. Since $\omega_1\text{-Tc}\,\text{Po}_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ contains all isomorphisms, 2.6 implies that $\mathcal{S}$ is $\omega_1$-special. Observe that $P$ in 2.6 is countable because $X \subseteq P \subseteq Y$ and $X, Y$ are countable. □

**Corollary 5.5.** *Let $\kappa$ be an uncountable regular cardinal and $\mathcal{S}$ consist of monomorphisms between countable Boolean algebras. Then, up to isomorphism, there is the unique $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S}, \kappa)$-injective Boolean algebra of size $\kappa$.*

*Proof.* It follows from 4.3, 4.5 and 5.4. □

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let $\lambda \leq \kappa$ be regular cardinals such that $\kappa^{<\lambda} = \kappa$. Then, up to isomorphism, there is the unique $\mathcal{M}_\lambda$-cellular $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}_\lambda, \kappa)$-injective Boolean algebra of size $\kappa$.*

*Proof.* Like in 5.4, $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}_\lambda)$ is $\lambda$-special. □

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the class of all isometries in* **Ban** *and $\mathcal{S}$ consist of isometries between separable Banach spaces. Then $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S})$ is $\aleph_1$-special.*

*Proof.* $\mathcal{M}$ is special following 2.5 (3). Separable Banach spaces coincide with those having the size $\aleph_0$. Since $\omega_1\text{-Tc}\,\text{Po}_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ contains all isomorphisms, 2.6 implies that $\mathcal{S}$ is $\aleph_1$-special. Observe that $P$ in 2.6 is separable because $X \subseteq P \subseteq Y$ and $X, Y$ are separable. □

**Corollary 5.8.** *Let $\kappa$ be an uncountable regular cardinal. Then, up to isomorphism, there is a unique $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S}, \kappa)$-injective Banach space of size $\kappa$.*

*Proof.* It follows from 4.3, 4.5 and 5.7. □

**Proposition 5.9.** *Let $\lambda \leq \kappa$ be regular cardinals such that $\kappa^{<\lambda} = \kappa$. Then, up to isomorphism, there is the unique $\mathcal{M}_\lambda$-cellular $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}_\lambda, \kappa)$-injective Banach space of the density character $\kappa$.*

*Proof.* Like in 5.7, $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}_\lambda)$ is $\lambda$-special. Observe that $P$ in 2.6 has the density character $< \kappa$ becausee $P \subseteq Y$ and $Y$ has the density character $< \kappa$. □

**Remark 5.10.** (1) A Boolean algebra $B$ has size $\kappa$ if and only if $|B| = \kappa$. Thus 5.5 implies [4] Theorem 4 and 5.6 implies the result mentioned in [4], Section 6. We only have to show that any $f \in \text{Po}(\mathcal{S})$ is a pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{f} & L \\ {\scriptstyle u}\uparrow & & \uparrow \\ X & \xrightarrow[s]{} & Y \end{array}$$

where $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $u \in \mathcal{M}$. For this, it suffices to express $f$ as a pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{f} & L \\ {\scriptstyle u'}\uparrow & & \uparrow \\ X' & \xrightarrow[s']{} & Y' \end{array}$$

with $s' \in \mathcal{S}$, take the factorization $u' = uu''$ where $u''$ is an epimorphism and $u$ a regular monomorphism and take a pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{s} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle u''}\uparrow & & \uparrow \\ X' & \xrightarrow[s']{} & Y' \end{array}$$

Clearly, $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

(2) A Banach space has size $\kappa$ if and only if its density character is $\kappa$. Thus 5.8 is [4] Theorem 16 and 5.9 is [4] Theorem 35. We again use the (epimorphism, regular monomorphism) factorization of $u$.

**Examples 5.11.** (1) Let **CAlg** be the category of commutative unital $C^*$-algebras algebras and $\mathcal{M}$ the class of monomorphisms. Since **CAlg** is a variety of algebras with $\aleph_0$-ary operations (see [16]), **CAlg** is locally $\aleph_1$-presentable (see [2] 3.28). $\aleph_1$-presentable objects coincide with separable $C^*$-algebras. Since $\mathbf{CAlg}^{\mathrm{op}}$ is the category of compact Hausdorff spaces, monomorphisms in **CAlg** coincide with regular monomorphisms and **CAlg** is coregular. Thus $\mathcal{M}$ is special. Let $\mathcal{S}$ consist of monomorphisms between separable $C^*$-algebras. Note that separable commutative unital $C^*$-algebras are precisely $C(X)$ where $X$ is a compact metrizable topological space (see [11]). Following 2.6, $\mathcal{S}$ is $\aleph_1$-special. A $C^*$-algebra $K$ has the size continuum if and only if $|K| = c$. Following 4.3 and 4.5, there is the unique $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S}, c)$-injective $C^*$-algebra. Assuming GCH, this is $C(\beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N})$ (see [18] 7.1). Observe that $\beta(\mathbb{N}) \setminus \mathbb{N}$ corresponds to the Boolean algebra $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin$ in the Stone duality.

Again, we could do it for any regular cardinal $\kappa$ such that $\kappa^{\aleph_0} = \kappa$. In this case, the size equals to the cardinality of the underlying set. Note that **CAlg** has enough $\mathcal{M}$-injectives and that $\mathcal{M}$-injective commutative unital $C^*$-algebras are precisely $C(X)$ where $X$ is extremally disconnected compact Hausdorff space (see [14]). In the Stone duality, these spaces correspond to complete Boolean algebras (see [14]). Hence the category of $\mathcal{M}$-injective commutative $C^*$-algebras is isomorphic the the category of complete Boolean algebras. Since this category is not accessible, $\mathcal{M}$ is not cofibrantly generated (cf. [1]).

(2) Let **Heyt** be the category of Heyting algebras and $\mathcal{M}$ the class of monomorphisms. Since epimorhisms are surjective in **Heyt** (see [17]), monomorphisms coincide with regular monomorphisms. Thus **Heyt** is coregular (see [22]). **Heyt** is locally finitely presentable and $\mathcal{M}$ is special. If $K$ is not finitely presentable then the size of $K$ equals to $|K|$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ consist of monomorphisms between countable Heyting algebras. Following 2.6, $\mathcal{S}$ is $\aleph_1$-special. Thus, following 4.3 and 4.5, there is the unique $\mathcal{S}$-cellular $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S}, \kappa)$-injective Heyting algebra for any uncountable regular cardinal $\kappa$.

Note that, since $\mathcal{M}$-injective Heyting algebras coincide with complete Boolean algebras ([7]), **Heyt** does not have enough $\mathcal{M}$-injectives. Thus $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^{\square})$ is not a weak factorization system. Hence $\mathcal{M}$ is not cofibrantly generated.

(3) The same situation is in the category **Gr** of groups. Monomorphisms coincide with regular monomoprhisms, **Gr** is coregular and **Gr** does not have enough injectives (see [17]).

(4) The category **Pos** of posets (and isotone mappings) is locally finitely presentable, coregular and regular monomorphisms coincide with embeddings. Since $\mathcal{M}$-injectives are complete lattices, the class $\mathcal{M}$ of regular monomorphisms is not cofibrantly generated (see [1]). Thus the situation is the same as in **Bool**.

## References


[1] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, J. Rosický and W. Tholen, *Weak factorization systems and topological functors*, Appl. Categ. Str. 10 (2002), 237-249.

[2] J. Adámek and J. Rosický, *Locally Presentable and Accessible Categories*, Cambridge University Press 1994.

[3] J.Adámek and J. Rosický, *What are locally generated categories?*, Proc. Categ. Conf. Como 1990, Lect. Notes in Math. 1488 (1991), 14-19.

[4] A. Avilés and C. Brech, *A Boolean algebra and a Banach space obtained by push-out iteration*, Top. Appl. 158 (2011), 1534-1550.

[5] A. Avilés, F. C. Sánchez, J. M. F. Castillo, M. Gonzáles and Y. Moreno, *Banach spaces of universal disposition*, J. Fun. Anal. 261 (2011), 2347-2361.

[6] A. Avilés, F. C. Sánchez, J. M. F. Castillo, M. Gonzáles and Y. Moreno, *$\aleph$-injective Banach spaces and $\aleph$-projective compacta*, arXiv:1406.6733.

[7] R. Balbes and A. Horn, *Injective and projective Heyting algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 48 (1970), 549-559.

[8] T. Beke, *Sheafifiable homotopy model categories*, Math. Proc. Cambr. Phil. Soc. 129 (2000), 447-475.

[9] T. Beke and J. Rosický, *Abstract elementary classes and accessible categories*, Annals Pure Appl. Logic 163 (2012), 2008-2017.

[10] W. Boney, R. Grossberg, M. Lieberman, J. Rosický and S. Vasey, *$\mu$-abstract elementary classes and other generalizations*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 220 (2016), 3048-3066.

[11] C.-Y. Chou, *Notes on the separability of $C^*$-algebras*, Taivanese J. Math. 16 (2012), 555-559.

[12] H. B. Cohen, *Injective envelopes of Banach spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 70 (1964), 723-726.

[13] S. Geschke, *On tightly $\kappa$-filtered Boolean algebras*, Algebra Universalis 47 (2002), 69-93.

[14] A. M. Gleason, *Projective topological spaces*, Illinois J. Math. 2 (1958), 482-489.

[15] P. R. Halmos, *Lectures in Boolean Algebras*, Van Nostrand 1963.

[16] J. R. Isbell, *Generating the algebraic theory of C(X)*, Alg. Univ. 15 (1982), 153-155.

[17] E. W. Kiss, L. Márki, P. Pröhle and W. Tholen, *Categorical algebraic properties. A compendium on amalgamation, congruence extension, epimorphisms, residual smallness, and injectivity*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar, 1983.

[18] W. Kubiś, *Fraïssé sequences - a category-theoretic approach to universal homogeneous structures*, Annals of Pure Appl. Logic 165 (2014), 1755-1811.

[19] M. Makkai and R. Paré, *Accessible Categories: The Foundations of Categorical Model Theory*, AMS 1989.

[20] M. Makkai, J. Rosický and L. Vokřínek, *On a fat small object argument*, Adv. Math. 254 (2014), 49-68.

[21] I. I. Parovicenko, *A universal bicompact of weight* $\aleph$, Soviet Math. Dokl. 4 (1963) 592-595.

[22] A. M. Pitts, *Amalgamation and interpolation in the category of Heyting algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 29 (1983) 155-165.

[23] C. M. Ringel, *The intersection property of amalgamation*, J. Pure Appl. Alg. 2 (1972), 341-342.

[24] J. Rosický, *Accessible categories, saturation and categoricity*, J. Symb. Logic 62 (1997), 891-901.

[25] J. Rosický and W. Tholen, *Factorizations, fibrations and torsion*, J. Hom. Rel. Str. 2 (2007), 295-314.

J. Rosický
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Masaryk University, Faculty of Sciences
Kotlářská 2, 611 37 Brno, Czech Republic
rosicky@math.muni.cz